

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the Non-final Office Action mailed May 12, 2009 ("Action"). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 29, 30, 34, 54, 55, 64, and 65 stand under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock (US 2001/0015756) in view of Moore (US 2004/0189707).

Claims 16, 25-27, 31, 32, 35-37, 56, 58-60, and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Moore, in further view of Rothmuller (US 2003/0033296).

Claims 24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Moore, in further view of Takahashi (US 5,537,528).

Claim stands is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Moore, in further view of Wang (US 5,802,361).

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Moore, in further view of Nagaoka (US 6,992,710).

Claims 49-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock, Moore, and Nagaoka, in further view of Rothmuller.

Claims 63, 66, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilcock and Moore, in further view of Kobayashi (US 2003/0217118).

Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

A. Comments on Claim 14 and its Dependent Claims

Claim 14 has been amended to recite “a processor configured to: . . . identify a calendar entry in a calendar application based on the image date of the at least one image; [and] provide a suggestion for a metadata subject field of the at least one image based on the calendar entry.”

Support for this amendment may be found at least in paragraph 54 of the published application.

See US 2005/0050043. An example of this claim feature described in paragraph 54 is:

“When the device recognizes that a picture is taken and stored in the device memory, the device would then add time and date information automatically, and may look to current entries in the user's calendar in order to provide a suggestion to the user for the metadata subject field. For example, at the time a user creates an image with a mobile device, the current calendar entry could be ‘meeting with supervisor.’ The device might then suggest ‘meeting with supervisor,’ ‘supervisor’ and/or ‘meeting’ as subject(s) for the image.”

Wilcock, alone or in combination with Moore, fails to teach or suggest providing any such suggestion for a metadata subject field of an image based on a calendar entry. Instead, Wilcock indicates that a user may input a title, short description, and a semantic location for a photo, (*see* Wilcock, ¶54-56), but does not indicate that any of these are suggested based on a calendar entry. For instance, Wilcock specifies that the short title is a “short descriptor of the photo provided by the user,” the description is a “fuller user-provided description of the photo,” and the semantic location is a “user-meaningful location description (e.g. Eiffel Tower) as opposed to the coordinates provided by the location data.” Further, Wilcock does not even use the term calendar.

Moreover, Moore also fails to provide the claimed suggestion. Moore describes a “virtual folder descriptions database 232 [that] includes . . . virtual folder descriptions” and “sends data to the query builder component 220, including a list of types to display in the folder,

the initial filter, and the physical locations to show results from (the scopes).” *See Moore*, ¶175. Moore does not, however, indicate that the virtual folder descriptions are suggested based on a calendar entry, and hence are not analogous to the claimed providing of a suggestion. Further, Moore does not even use the term calendar. Thus, the amendment to claim 14 defines over the combination of Moore and Wilcock. The Action cited the other references for other reasons, and not to disclose the claimed providing. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 defines over the cited combination of references, request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and submit that amended claim 14 is in condition for allowance.

The pending claims that depend on claim 14 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim, in addition to the features they recite.

B. Comments on Claims 48, 54, 64, and 65 and their respective Dependent Claims

Independent claims 48, 54, 64, and 65 have been amended and are allowable at least for reasons analogous to those given in support of amended claim 14.

The pending claims that respectively depend on claims 48, 54, 64, and 65 are allowable at least due to their dependence on an allowable claim, in addition to the features they recite.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: September 10, 2009

By: Christopher M. Swickhamer  
Christopher M. Swickhamer  
Registration No. 59,853  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive,  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001